

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/581,759	Applicant(s) MORROW ET AL.	
	Examiner Leigh C. Maier	Art Unit 1623	

All Participants:
Status of Application: after final

 (1) Leigh C. Maier.

(3) _____.

 (2) Russ Widom.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 24 September 2010
Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

 Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

none

Claims discussed:

34

Prior art documents discussed:

none
Part II.
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

Exr inquired about claim 34 to verify that Applicant intended "acetylglucosamine" rather than "acetyllactosamine." The claim recites the former, but from a review of the specification, it appears possible that the latter might actually be intended. Mr Widom confirmed that Applicant intended "acetyllactosamine" and authorized an examiner's amendment to make this change.

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)